

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Airport

**Member:** Alex Erskine 828-4966

**Project Name:** Jean F. Roy/Ocean Place Hotel

**Case #:** 55-R-01

**Date:** November 27, 2001

**Comments:**

- 1) A Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration form (7460-1) must be filed with the FAA and a determination of no hazard to air navigation issued since the proposed building exceeds 200 feet in height.
- 2) A second Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration form (7460-1) must be filed with the FAA for any construction crane or equipment that will be used to construct the building.

**Recommendations:**

- 1) The two notices should be filed with the FAA as soon as possible since it typically takes at least 60 days for the FAA to issue a determination.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Engineering

**Member:** Tim Welch  
Engineering Design Mgr.  
Office Ph. (954) 828-5123  
Office Fax: (954) 828-5275  
Email: [timw@cityfort.com](mailto:timw@cityfort.com)

**Project Name:** Ocean Place Hotel  
Site Plan Review

**Case #:** 55-R-01

**Date:** 11/27/01

**Comments :**

1. The engineer shall design, apply for, and obtain the appropriate general or surface water management license from the Broward County Department of Environmental Protection (BCDPEP). This license and associated calculations for compliance with the applicable surface water management criteria must be submitted with the application for Building Permit.
2. Please provide a Broward County Right of Way map which depicts the existing right of way section on S.R. A-1-A for the frontage of this project. Satisfaction of the Broward Co. Trafficways Plan is required pursuant to Section 47-25.2 of the Unified Land Development Regulations. An eighty five (85) foot wide section is required at this location. The forms required for any dedication of public right of way will be provided to the applicant following review of the requirements.
3. Review the width of sidewalk requirements with Planning staff. Wide (10 ft.) sidewalks have generally been required along S.R. A-1-A.
4. Insufficient stacking is provided per Section 47-20.5 ULDR. Please review this section and resolve this discrepancy. It appears that only 6 or 7 feet is provided along Vistamar Street while 76 ft. is required (1% of parking capacity) for inbound vehicles, and 22 ft. for outbound vehicles.
5. The submitted traffic impact analysis has been delivered to Kittelson & Associates, Inc. for review. Additional comments will be provided within 3 to 4 weeks and Kittelson shall review site circulation as well as regional and local traffic impacts, and suggest improvements.

# DRC

## SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT

### REPORT

6. A completed engineering drawing set shall include :

- a. Paving & Drainage Plan
- b. Pavement Marking & Signage Plan
- c. Water and Sewer Plan
- d. Details and specifications

It's noted that some of these design drawings are prepared in the submitted set. We would need to review the final set of plans prior to final DRC authorization for permit application.

7. Right of way improvements shall be required in accordance with Section 47-25.2 and include but not be limited to the following :

- a. Water and Sewer facilities for service to this facility, including all restoration.
- b. Stormwater facilities, curb and gutter, sidewalk, accesses in accordance with Engineering Department standards, including all restoration.
- c. Street reconstruction including sloped overlay or new asphalt and reworked base following utility improvements, striping, and signs necessary for adequate parking and traffic circulation.

8. Please evaluate any and all metered public parking that is to be impacted by this plan. By this we mean indicate all existing metered public parking on the site plan and count the number of spaces which are to be offset by this owner. Arrange to meet Doug Gottshall, Parking Division Manager to determine the appropriate means to resolve these losses prior to final DRC authorization.

9. A staging and storage plan shall be presented for Engineering Department review prior to DRC authorization.

10. A dewatering plan shall be presented prior to issuance of a foundation permit. If the applicant doesn't have a contractor selected during DRC process, the owner may provide a letter attesting to their agreement to provide a dewatering and discharge management plan for engineering department review prior to (or with) their application for foundation permit.

11. A photometric lighting plan in accordance with Section 47-20.14 of the Unified Land Development Regulations shall be required prior to final DRC authorization.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Fire

**Member:** Albert Weber  
828-5875

**Project Name:** Ocean Place Hotel

**Case #:** 55-R-01

**Date:** 11-27-01

**Comments:**

- 1) 8 Inch fire line required with 8 inch DDC
- 2) Flow test required
- 3) All stairs must 3109 SFBC.
- 4) Exit separation problem in garage.
- 5) Chapter 51 applies.
- 6) Consider 1804.1 SFBC.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Info. Systems

**Member:** Mark Pallans (GRG)  
828-5790

**Project Name:** Jean F. Roy/Ocean Place Hotel

**Case #:** 55-R-01

**Date:** November 27, 2001

**Comments:**

Our previous comments of April 24<sup>th</sup> still apply. We acknowledge the facilities identified on sheet number A1.21 for communications equipment use.

**Recommendations:**

A bi-directional amplifier system shall be installed per previous comments of April 24<sup>th</sup>.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Landscape

**Member:** Dave Gennaro  
828-5200

**Project Name:**  
Jean F. Roy/ Ocean Place Hotel

**Case #:** 55-R-01

**Date:** 11/27/01

**Comments:**

1. Make sure the sight triangle is clear. There may be a slight encroachment.
2. Indicate any existing trees or palms on site. All Tree Preservation Ordinance requirements apply. If appropriate, any existing trees or palms that are considered good candidates for relocation should be relocated. Otherwise, provide the appropriate calculations for equivalent replacement.
3. Indicate any utilities (such as overhead powerlines) that would affect proposed planting on the Landscape Plan.
4. Verify whether or not there is a conflict between proposed planting on the north side of the property and adjacent planting or structures.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Planning **Member** Chris Barton  
828 5849

**Project Name** Ocean Place Hotel **Case #** 55-R-01

**Date** November 27, 2001

**Comments:**

This proposal is for a 21 level, 242 room hotel with two restaurants (3900s.f. x 2), retail space (490s.f.), a private spa (2,060s.f.), meeting rooms (7,137s.f.) and an internal, all valet, 346 space parking garage located in the ABA district of the Central Beach Area RAC and lying adjacent to a site which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

1) Project requires review by the Planning and Zoning Board and City Commission as Site Plan Levels III and IV. This application seeks exemption from certain requirements of the ULDR which were incorporated in City Ordinances: C-00-26, Secs. 47-12.4.C.c, 47-12.4.C.d, 47-24/Table 1 and 47-25.3.A.3.e.iv; C-01-10, Secs. 47-12.5.B.8 and 47-25.3.A.3.e.iv; and C-01-15, 47-2.2.C, all under the provisions of ULDR Sec. 47-26.A.1, Request for Application of Prior Zoning Regulation.

2) When application is made for the Planning and Zoning Board, please provide a set of plans with the site data table and site plan in a prominent location in the plan set. Site data, building floor plans and elevations should be presented first, with engineering and landscape information following.

3) The parking requirement for the spa area is one space per 200s.f. for a total of 11 and the parking table does not indicate the 489s.f. retail space with a parking requirement of 2. The required parking for the proposed facility appears to be 351 spaces, please verify and correct as needed.

4) Discuss findings of the traffic study with Engineering Rep. Staff and a City Consultant when comments are available.

5) Discuss with Engineering representative the required driveway cuts and proposed changes to the existing median and public parking spaces.

6) Correct the land use map on Sheet A0.02 to accurately reflect the land use designations of the area.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

7) Strongly recommend presenting project to Central Beach Alliance and neighbors prior to public hearings for public input.

8) Provide a clear shadow study for December and March 21 to indicate the impacts on the adjacent properties. The study submitted is difficult if not impossible to read. The photos used appear to be altered in that they enlarge several of the existing tower structures located in the photos. Please use unaltered photos. The corrected shadow study must be submitted with any application for the Planning and Zoning Board.

9) Discuss parking structure's circulation with Engineering Rep. and applicant at the meeting. Discuss stacking at the western entry and the several turn around areas for valet operations. There is a concern that there is not sufficient holding area to operate the valet system in several areas of the garage.

10) The Vistamar facade does not appear to meet the people street requirements. While there appears to be a cornice below 35' for the main hotel structure there is not one for the parking structure.

11) Indicate the sizes and required loading areas with dimensions as well as the dimensions of the adjacent drive lanes. Show how the trash will be removed from the trash rooms shown.

12) Discuss the parking ramp slopes with the Engineering representative.

13) Indicate the total size of the outdoor dining areas for both the restaurant and the café areas. The total customer service areas and outdoor seating areas for both operations appear to be greater than 7,800s.f. (3,900s.f. for each) in size as indicated in the site data table. Indicate the correct sizes of all areas shown on the plans delineate the C.S.A. for each dining facility and discuss the accurate parking requirements with the Zoning representative.

14) A valet parking agreement will be required for the stacked parking arrangement shown. Agreement must be recorded and provided prior to receipt of a C.O. and valet parking must be available at all times of building operation.

15) Discuss FAR calculation with Zoning Rep. The FAR appears to be 4.1 which would require the application of the bonus density allowed in the ABA district if the application under Section 47-26.A.1 is approved. The ULDR Section cited on Sheet A0.02 is incorrect and should read 47-12.5.B.3.b.

16) Provide a detailed section of the parking garage wall to show the relationship of the proposed green screen wall, any wall openings and the parked automobiles.



# DRC

## SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT

### REPORT

17) Will the parking structure be fully enclosed and mechanically ventilated? Indicate where ventilators will be placed on plans. Denote all parking garage openings by the use of shading on the elevation drawings. Parking structure must comply with Ord. C-00-65.

18) Provide additional information in the comprehensive analysis of all impacts including but not limited to, shadow as it may effect water quality and vegetation, effects during construction, the possibility of groundwater levels alteration, construction and operational noise impacts, lighting impacts, and others that the proposal may have upon the adjacent National Register Site, and **discuss fully all proposed efforts and design features to mitigate those impacts**. This analysis may be sent for review by City Consultants qualified to perform historic resources analysis and all costs for such review shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

19) The following list of Goals, Objectives and Policies as stated in the City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan, Historic Preservation Element, apply to the proposed development. At a minimum, provide a statement of how each of these, and any other applicable Comprehensive Plan provisions, have been addressed by this development proposal:

Historic Preservation Element

Goal 1 – to provide for the identification, recognition and evaluation for the historic resources of Fort Lauderdale and to **enhance public awareness and involve them in various applicable aspects of historic preservation**

Objective 10 **Preserve, when possible, existing mechanisms for the notification and involvement of historic property owners and the interested public in historic preservation activities.**

Objective 11 **Integrate the review of impacts on historic and archaeological resources** into the city's land development regulations and into the existing regulatory framework of state, regional and local government agencies.

Policy 11.2 Require **all development proposals from the private or public sector which are subject to DRC review to indicate the location, extent, status and proposed impact to historic** or archaeological resources, utilizing available survey data or the results of historic or archaeological assessments made for the express purpose of providing said information.

Policy 11.3 **All proposed impacts to historic resources shall be reported to the Historic Preservation Board for review and comment.**

See also pages 11-3 and 11-4 Historic Element support.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

20) Provide detail of all colors and materials to be used for all exterior surfaces prior to being placed on agenda for the Planning and Zoning Board and as a part of each submittal set for the Board and for the City Commission.

21) Provide two oblique aerial drawings from opposing views, which indicate the mass outline of all proposed structure(s) and the outlines of the adjacent existing and previously approved structures. These mass studies are to be shown on an aerial photograph or by use of an isometric perspective or axonometric drawing of the site and the surrounding adjacent area and are to be provided with any application to the Planning and Zoning Board.

22) Provide a copy of the most current recorded plat and amendments, for the proposed site.

23) On all elevations indicate the various floor heights and show relationship of adjacent streets and the mass outlines of all adjacent structures.

24) Provide a table indicating the required and all proposed setbacks for the project. This table is to be indicated on the site plan as a part of the site data information area, and any request to modify the setbacks are to be noted on the site plan.

25) Additional comments may be forthcoming at the meeting.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

Division: Police

Member: Robert Dodder  
828-6421 beeper 497-0628

Project Name: Ocean Place Hotel

Case #: 55-R-01

Date: 11/27/01

**Comments:**

The north wall is an area of concern. The landscaped area that is contained within the solid north wall and the CBS wall of the Bartlett Estate creates a secluded location for street people, prostitutes, etc. At the least, entry to that area should have climb resistant fencing and gates of equal height as the wall at both the east and west ends. Video motion detection and lighting to support effective use of the cameras.

Guest rooms, secondary entry points, amenity doors and all non-public areas should be on a card reader access control system that is capable of producing an audit trail.

Room safes should be considered.

C.C.T.V. should be installed in the parking garage and other specific areas of the hotel. This system should be monitored and recorded.

The parking garage should have an emergency communication system installed and have direct connection to security.

The path from the parking garage elevator to the hotel lobby and restaurant area seems to be creating a vehicle / pedestrian conflict.

Stair doors, at grade, should not allow entry to the building from the exterior.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Zoning

**Member:** Terry Burgess  
828-5913

**Project Name:** Jean F. Roy & Philip Tasse/Ocean  
Place Hotel

**Case #:** 55-R-01

**Date:** 11/27/01

**Comments:**

1. Project requires Planning and Zoning Board and City Commission.
2. Provide a narrative outlining compliance with Ord. 00-26 regarding People Street (Vistamar) requirements. Provide a point by point analysis.
3. The maximum length of a structure shall be two hundred (200) feet and width two hundred (200) feet. However, on the east and west side of a residential or hotel structure an unenclosed balcony not exceeding an eight (8) foot extension into the setback area is permitted. A greater dimension of a structure in the east/west direction only for the portion of a structure up to fifty five (55) feet in height may be approved pursuant to Site Plan Level IV Development permit requirements only if the structure does not exceed two hundred fifty (250) in height Ord. C-01.
4. Adequacy requirements of section 47-25.2 apply to the proposed development along with a hurricane evacuation analysis. Provide a narrative outlining compliance section by section.
5. Neighborhood compatibility and preservation requirements of section 47-25.3.A.1, A.2 and A.3 a, b, c and d apply to the proposed development. In addition it shall be determine if a development meets the Design and Community Compatibility Criteria in accordance with Ord. No. C-00-26. Provide a narrative outlining how the proposed development complies section by section.
6. Provide parking for Spa/ Gym at a rate of 1/200 gross square feet of floor area in accordance with section 47-20.2.
7. Provide a photometric lighting plan in accordance with section 47-20.14 prior to Final DRC review.
8. Valet parking agreement required in accordance with section 47-20.18.B.

# DRC

## SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT

### REPORT

9. Provide a staging, material storage and construction/sales trailer location plan prior to Final DRC review.

**10. Does the restaurant square footage include the kitchens and food storage areas.**

11. Discuss site circulation with Engineering.

12. Parking garage shall comply with Ordinance 00-65.

13. Projects requiring Site Plan Levels III and IV review, on sites with in the Downtown RAC and lying east of the Intracoastal Waterway, provide two (2) oblique aerial drawings from opposing views which indicate the mass outline of all proposed structure(s) and the outlines of the adjacent existing and previously approved structures. The mass studies are to be shown on an aerial photograph or by use of an isometric perspective or axonometric drawing of the site and the surrounding adjacent area.

14. Provide a shadow study, which indicates the impact on the beach and neighboring properties.

15. Request for application of prior zoning regulation shall comply with the criteria setforth in section 47-26.A.1.G.

16. Additional comments maybe discussed at DRC meeting.